

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

The Applicants wish to thank the examiner for the careful consideration of their arguments and evidence. Applicants have amended the claims to address the informalities noted in the Office Action. Claims 1-4, 7, 9 – 19, 41, 43 - 44 are pending in this Application. Applicant's amendments seek to expedite prosecution and to obtain an early Notice of Allowance; no equivalents are disclaimed by this amendment.

The Office Action mailed on September 18, 2006, includes the following rejections:

1. Claims 41-44 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112 first paragraph.
2. Claims 1-4, 7, 9-19 and 41-44 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112 second paragraph.
3. Claim 42 is considered duplicative.
4. Claims 15-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Sondell, et al (Brain Research, 1998).
5. Claims 1-4, 7, 9, 10 and 12-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(b) as being obvious over Sondell, in view of Hjelmeland (US 4,372,888) in further view of Atala (US 6,376,244).

Applicants respectfully address the basis for each of the Action's rejections below.

Claim Rejections – Claims 41-44 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph.

The Action rejects claims 41-44 for lack of enablement. Claims 41, 42 and 43 have been amended to satisfy the enablement requirement under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph. Applicants respectfully request the withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph.

Claim Rejections – Claims 41-44 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph.

The Action rejects claims 41-44 as being indefinite. The rejected claims have been amended to overcome the rejections. Applicants respectfully request the withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph.

Claims 15-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated.

The Action rejects claims 15-29 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Sondell, et al. The claims have been amended to overcome the present rejection. Applicants respectfully request the withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b).

Application No. 10/672,689
Supp. Amdt. dated Dec. 13, 2007
Reply to Office Action of Sept. 13, 2007

Claims 1-4, 7, 9, 10 and 12-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(b) as being obvious over Sondell, in view of Hjelmeland (US 4,372,888) in further view of Atala (US 6,376,244).

The Action rejects claims 1-4, 7, 9, 10 and 12-14 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(b) as being obvious. Applicants respectfully submit that the claims as amended overcome the *prima facie* case for obviousness and respectfully request the withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103.


Conclusion

In light of the remarks and arguments presented above, Applicants respectfully submit that all the claims in the Application are in condition for allowance. Favorable consideration and a Notice of Allowance for pending claims 1-4, 7, 9 - 19, 41, 43 - 44 are therefore respectfully requested.

Applicants believe no fees are due at this time. If the Examiner has any questions or comments, or if further clarification is required, it is requested that the Examiner contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

Dated: December 13, 2007.

Respectfully submitted,



Edwin S. Flores
Reg. No. 38,453

ATTORNEY FOR APPLICANTS

Customer No. 34,725
Chalker Flores, LLP
2711 LBJ Freeway Suite 1036
Dallas, TX 75234
214.866.0001 Telephone
214.866.0010 Facsimile